UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,187	02/27/2002	Joseph A. Kwak	I-2-0203.4US	3548

24374   7590   06/11/2008
VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C.
DEPT. ICC
UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER
RYMAN, DANIEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 April 2008_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1 and 4-6_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1 and 4-6_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _1/11/08; 3/21/08; 5/22/08_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 4-6 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The information disclosure statements filed 11 January 2008, 21 march 2008, and 22

May 2008 fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited

foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to

be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. They have been

placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Objections

3.   Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 15, "packet that that

packet has" should be "packet that has" and, in line 35, "retransmission rate or retransmission

rate or link" should be "retransmission rate or link quality". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing

to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the

invention.

6.   Claim 4 recites: "wherein the packets are transmitted using a single carrier having a

frequency domain equalization (SC-FDE) air interface". Claim 1, which claim 4 depends upon,

has been amended to recite: "wherein the packets are transmitted using an orthogonal frequency division multiple access (OFDMA) air interface". It is unclear whether the air interface is SC-FDE or OFDMA. Examiner will not examine claim 4 for purposes of the prior art because Examiner cannot interpret the claim in a manner that would not require Examiner to modify the scope of claim 4 by eliminating the "SC-FDE" limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schramm et al. (USPN 6,208,663), of record, in view of Roobol et al. (USPN 6,301,479), of record, in further view of Dirschedl et al. (USPN 6,262,994), of record, in further view of Hunzinger et al. (USPN 7,164,654), of record, in further view of Dahlman et al. (USPN 6,907,005), of record, in further view of Frodigh et al. (USPN 5,726,978).

9.   Regarding claim 1, Schramm discloses a method for adjusting data modulation at a subscriber unit (col. 5, lines 47-58, where both the mobile station, i.e. "subscriber," and the base station support multiple modulation schemes), comprising: receiving data at a transmitter for transmission (col. 5, lines 59-65, where an LLC frame is received at the transmitter for transmission), wherein the received data is received in data blocks from a higher layer ARQ mechanism (col. 4, line 57-col. 5, line 4, where the system is a GPRS system, and Roobol: col. 2, lines 11-24, which discloses that in GPRS systems the LLC layer is an ARQ protocol in addition

to the RLC being an ARQ protocol, such that the RLC layer will receive data in data blocks from

a higher layer ARQ mechanism); formatting the received data into packets for transmission,

wherein the packets are smaller in size than the data blocks, and each packet having a forward

error correction (FEC) encoding/data modulation (Fig. 4(a) and col. 5, lines 59-65, where the

LLC is formatted into RLC blocks, where the modulation scheme for transmission of an RLC

block changes depending on the circumstances, and col. 5, lines 47-58, where FEC varies in

addition to or independent of modulation); appending an error check sequence for each packet

(Fig. 2 and col. 3, line 16, where each packet has a block check sequence appended thereto);

transmitting the packets (col. 5, lines 47-58, where it is inherent that a "transmitting entity"

transmits to a "receiving entity"); storing the packets for retransmission in a buffer memory

incorporated into the transmitter (col. 7, lines 14-20, where "retriev[ing] the FEC encoded block

identified in a negative ARQ acknowledgement from storage" indicates that the packets are

stored for retransmission in a memory incorporated into the transmitter, and where it is implicit,

or at the very least strongly suggested, that the storage is a buffer since buffers are storage

devices for short-term storage of packets); monitoring a return channel for receipt of an

acknowledgment for each packet that that packet has been received (col. 6, lines 60-67, where

the receiver "signals [to transmitter] for retransmission of block 40 using any well known ARQ

routine" and where Examiner takes official notice that sending acknowledgements for each

properly received packet is a "well-known ARQ routine"); retransmitting an original or

selectively modified packet at the transmitter (col. 7, lines 14-20, where the system "retrieves the

FEC encoded block identified in a negative ARQ acknowledgement from storage" such that an

"original or selectively modified packet" is retransmitted), if an acknowledgment for that packet

has not been received within a predetermined period of time (where a retransmission is sent upon

receipt of a negative ARQ acknowledgement, col. 7, lines 14-17, and where ARQ signaling is

performed according to well known ARQ routines, col. 6, lines 60-67, such that a packet is

retransmitted if an acknowledgement for that packet has not been received given, as outlined

above, that a positive ARQ acknowledgement comprises a ACK signal); collecting

retransmission statistics (col. 7, lines 6-9, where the transmitter counts the number of requests for

retransmitted blocks, i.e. "collects retransmission statistics"); and adjusting the particular

encoding/data modulation using the collected retransmission statistics, wherein if the collected

retransmission statistics indicate a low number of retransmissions, a higher capacity

encoding/modulation scheme is selected as the particular encoding/data modulation and if the

collected retransmission statistics indicate a high number of retransmissions, a lower capacity

encoding/data modulation scheme is selected as the particular encoding/data modulation (col. 7,

lines 1-9, where if an error rate is high, as indicated by a high number of requests for

retransmission, then the transmitter will select a modulation "designed to have improved noise

and/or interference resistance");

     Schramm in view of Roobol does not expressly disclose adjusting the particular

encoding/data modulation of each packet. Rather Schramm in view of Roobol teaches adjusting

the particular encoding/data modulation for only retransmitted packets (Schram: col. 3, line 65-

col. 4, line 3). Dirschedl teaches, in a system for adjusting the encoding/data modulation of

packets based on error rates, adjusting the particular encoding/data modulation of each packet

because this optimizes the data transmission (col. 1, lines 30-41). Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the particular

encoding/data modulation for each packet in order to optimize the data transmission.

Schramm in view of Roobol in further view of Dirschedl does not expressly disclose

limiting the number of retransmissions to an operator-defined integer value or clearing the buffer

memory after the integer value is reached. Hunzinger teaches, in a wireless ARQ system,

limiting the number of retransmissions to an operator-defined integer value (col. 7, lines 13-23,

where the number of retransmissions sent by a transmitting entity is limited by a MAR value

(which is presumably an integer since a transmitter cannot perform a fraction of a

retransmission), and col. 11, lines 24-46, where the MAR values are set by the transmitter, which

is broadly interpreted to be an "operator" since the transmitter "operates" the system, such that

the MAR values are "operator-defined"). Hunzinger does this to minimize latency created by the

continued re-transmission of messages (col. 7, lines 54-62). Therefore it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to limit the number of

retransmissions to an operator-defined integer value to minimize latency created by the

continued re-transmission of messages.

Hunzinger further discloses that the number of retransmissions may be limited by the

amount of memory available (col. 11, lines 29-32), which suggests that available memory space

should be maximized whenever possible. It is implicit that packets whose integer value has been

reached are "superfluous" since the packet will never be transmitted. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to clear the memory of

packets whose integer value has been reached to maximize the amount of memory space

available for other retransmissions.

Schramm in view of Roobol in further view of Dirschedl in further view of Hunzinger

does not expressly disclose combining the retransmitted original or selectively modified packet

with the transmitted packets. Dahlman teaches, in a wireless ARQ system, combining the

retransmitted original or selectively modified packet with the transmitted packets to make the

ARQ scheme more robust (col. 8, lines 26-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the retransmitted original or

selectively modified packet with the transmitted packets to make the ARQ scheme more robust.

Schramm in view of Roobol in further view of Dirschedl in further view of Hunzinger in

further view of Dahlman does not expressly disclose that the packets are transmitted using an

orthogonal frequency division multiple access (OFDMA) air interface or that the subchannels

from an OFDMA frequency set are nulled or added based on the quality of the subchannel.

However, Schramm in view of Roobol in further view of Dirschedl in further view of Hunzinger

in further view of Dahlman does disclose that the system can be used in a variety of types of

access methodologies (Schramm: col. 4, lines 49-56). Frodigh teaches, in a wireless system, that

"OFDM offers several advantages that are desirable in a cellular system" (col. 2, lines 38-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use an OFDMA system in order to take advantage of these advantages.

In addition, Frodigh teaches reconfiguring subcarriers in the OFDM system based on

quality measurements (col. 4, lines 55-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to preclude a poor quality subchannel for a

predetermined period and to add a previously nulled subchannel when it is of high quality to

ensure that only high quality subcarriers are used in the system.

10.   Regarding claim 5, Schramm in view of Roobol in further view of Dirschedl in further

view of Hunzinger in further view of Dahlman in further view of Cupo discloses that return

channel is a fast feedback channel (Schramm: col. 6, lines 60-67, where the TDM control

channel provided for signaling for retransmission is, as broadly defined, a "fast feedback

channel" since the control channel is devoted to signaling for retransmission) when the packets

are transmitted using a code division multiple access (CDMA) air interface (Schramm: col. 4,

lines 49-56, where the invention is usable in CDMA systems).

11.   Regarding claim 6, Schramm in view of Roobol in further view of Dirschedl in further

view of Hunzinger in further view of Dahlman in further view of Cupo discloses identifying a

packet as having an unacceptable error rate responsive to receipt of a negative acknowledgment

(Schramm: col. 7, lines 14-20).

Conclusion

12.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL J. RYMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-3152. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on (571)272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

<div style="text-align: right">

Daniel J. Ryman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2616

</div>

/Daniel J. Ryman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2616